

**San Francisco Estuary Project
Implementation Committee Meeting**

June 1, 2007

Elihu M. Harris State Building
Oakland, California

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Introductions/Approval of May 4, 2007 Meeting Summary

Tom Mumley, Chair of the Implementation Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:45 am. He proceeded with a round table of introductions. The Meeting Summary for May 4, 2007 was approved. Tom Mumley provided a brief overview of the meeting agenda.

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. CCMP Steering Committee Report

A. Draft Introduction

The draft CCMP Introduction was not ready for review. The Steering Committee requested approval from the Implementation Committee to review the Introduction and approve it for distribution in the Implementation Committee's August 3rd meeting packet. The request was approved.

B. Draft CCMP Update Support Resolution

Tom Mumley stated the key items for the August agenda would be adopting the Revised CCMP and the Resolution. There was a revised resolution in the June packet which the Steering Committee has reviewed. Any Implementation Committee member wishing to comment should respond between June 1 and the Steering Committee meeting scheduled for June 15, 2007.

Ellen Johnck asked if anything in the resolution was different from the 1993 Resolution. Marcia Brockbank replied that the revised resolution was based on the same format as the 1993 Resolution. Rick Morat proposed for clarification that year tags (1993 CCMP; 2007 CCMP) be placed on each item in the resolution. He also suggested a reordering of the paragraphs, but the committee voted to retain the original resolution order.

C. Revised Draft Media Strategy

There was a lengthy discussion on the revised media strategy. Tom Mumley stated the OpEd piece is a key piece of the media strategy.

Action: By August meeting present a draft of an OpEd piece.

Phil Bobel stated it would be helpful if program area facilitators came up with 2 or 3 of the most important changes in their area for a press release. Tom stated this was discussed at the Steering Committee and this information would be used for the Introduction, the Report Card, and an OpEd piece.

Arthur Feinstein stated an OpEd piece is good but an Editorial is better and should be included in the strategy. Luisa Valiela stated the media strategy did not specifically call for a press release and she thought it should.

Tom Mumley stated SFEP staff would approach the media with a press release, then try for an editorial or OpEd piece. Luisa wanted followup on the web cam idea, have we ever done it, who would do it? She wanted a better definition of how the web cam would work.

Tom Mumley noted the Committee had previously decided to do the press release/media outreach in conjunction with press for the State of the Estuary Conference which will generate more interest. Forrest Williams stated environmental reporters need to be nurtured to get them to attend and cover the conference.

D. Revised Process Schedule

After today's meeting, all program areas have been reviewed and adopted as corrected. Still needed is closure on the Introduction and Performance Measures leading to a revised document for distribution by July 19 for final approval at the August 3 Implementation Committee meeting. The final approved document would be submitted to the Executive Council by September 3, 2007.

Rick Morat stated that a briefing statement is needed to accompany the submittal for the Executive Council approval. Luisa Valiela and Forrest Williams volunteered to assist Rick with developing the statement.

Tom Mumley stated cost data would be consistent throughout based on a template adopted by the Steering Committee. Performance Measures were deferred to the Steering Committee but may be revisited with the Implementation Committee once there is a final document.

4. CCMP Land Use/Watershed Management Program Area

Tom Mumley noted this meeting was to give final approval for the revised Land Use/Watershed program area and outlined the process for approval; facilitators provide an overview of the work group's responses to comments, followed by final comments and the call for approval. Cathy Bleier, facilitator stated the chapter was edited to clarify and reduce some of the verbiage and address comments. Melanie Dettinger, Coastal Conservancy called for some additional actions but it was too late to include them as new actions, so the work group incorporated the suggestions into existing action items. It was noted the comment regarding FEMA from the first meeting at which the chapter was considered should be added to Action 2.3.

Further comments or questions:

Arthur Feinstein stated the language on page 4 #6 was too strong; "has been achieved"—too global a statement. It should read, "Improved management of stormwater runoff is leading to watershed protection."

Several members objected to singling out organizations by name (e.g., Sustainable Conservation) and felt references should be more generic.

Arthur's additional comments:

- 1) page 4 - rewrite #6
- 2) page 14 - Start "What" with 2nd paragraph on page 14, and reverse order.
- 3) page 14 - 3rd paragraph--don't name names
- 4) page 4 - #7, add "Many" to beginning

Both Michael Perrone and Forrest Williams felt references to organizational successes should be in the introduction under successes. Keep the “what” to recommendations related to the action.

Barbara Salzman comments:

page 3 - second paragraph use of dams awkward

page 5 - what is “roll up” --facilitators will delete

page 6 - paragraph #4 delete “many”...Michael Perrone: delete last sentence re “missed opportunities.” Arthur felt a separate bullet for staffing/cost issue is warranted.

page 6 - last paragraph—several edits suggested

page 14 - last bullet needs to be clarified—Resources Agency exemption should be CEQA exemption for small projects

page 20 - change “better” to “improved” in Action LU 2.5

page 23 - Action 2.6.1—delete out of kind –off site

page 25 - LU 2.7—delete enhancement

Ellen Johnck noted the US Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for navigation, flood protection, and ecological restoration. She wants the region to coordinate funding requests for restoration projects and felt this should be included in the CCMP, perhaps in action 5.2.

Fari Tabatabai noted projects with a watershed context have a higher ranking for funding. She would like the Corps added to 3.1 and 3.2.

Luisa Valiela comments:

Lot of editorial commentary

page 2 - paragraph 2, change “nesting” to “nested”

page 19 - under what— change to flooding planning

She will send additional comments.

Rick Morat: Action 2.8 on page 26 is duplicative of 4.3 (response: actions under objective 2 are for implementation, under objective 4 are public education and outreach).

Karen Rippey: page 3, 2nd paragraph needs rewriting—in stream reservoirs formed by dams—use of in-stream dams misleading; Michael Perrone: should be on-stream, not in-stream.

Tom Mumley concluded there have been a number of constructive suggestions to be included and asked for a motion to approve the Land Use/Watershed Management program area with corrections. **Action: Motion passed.**

5. CCMP Dredging and Waterway Modification Program Area

Steve Goldbeck, facilitator noted that there were a lot of revisions since the first presentation.

Fari Tabatabai asked if she could provide minor editorial comments; Steve agreed. Forrest Williams stated the numbers in the last paragraph on page 3 should be footnoted for validity.

Maxene Spellman comments:

page 7 - (top) should indicate the starting number from _____ to \$ 1.25 million cy

page 10 - 3rd bullet; requested clarification of the step-down process

page 23 - performance measures not in same format

page 24 - Action 5.3—buffer areas—add “identify buffer areas needed for expected coastal flooding.” Or could add to 5.1.

Arthur Feinstein:

Wants clarification of 5.1 — Steve G: Ok, will make 2 sentences.

Wants change of language on 5.2—Steve G :Ok

Maxene Spellman:

Add private foundations to who on 5.3; add private funds to what

Add Coastal Conservancy to who on 5.8

Luisa Valiela:

Comments on page 9; achievements nicely set up; revamp challenges into an introductory paragraph; she will provide follow-up email with edits.

Fari Tabatabai questioned what is “unnecessary dredging” on page 1?

Forrest Williams asked about the feasibility of hydrofoils—Steve—LTMS is using technology to reduce dredging.

Ellen Johnck wanted Action 5.5 to identify “cross-media impacts”—Steve G: will include in Glossary.

Add “find” to Action 6.1

Tom Mumley requested a motion for approval of the Dredging and Waterway Modification program area with corrections noted. **Action: Motion passed.**

Tom Mumley stated the Steering Committee will handle finalizing the overall Introduction, performance measures, and global editing requirements for master editor.

6. SFEP Activities

- Special interest license plate: effort by Coastal Conservancy is in progress; Marcia Brockbank will contact Sam Shuchat and Amy Hutzler to attempt a Bay connection.
- August 3, 2007: Implementation Committee meeting to consider final Draft 2007 CCMP from 9:30—10:30 am
- August 3, 2007: CCMP Report Card Workshop purpose—to update/truth-test draft report card. 11 am to 3 pm - lunch will be provided.
- State of the Estuary Conference scheduled for Oct. 16—18 (Tues—Thurs). Program development is underway. Day 1 and 2 will include plenary sessions on focused topics; Day 3 concurrent tracks on ecosystem restoration, pollutants, and land use. Call for Posters is out—due date July 20, 2007. Nominations for CCMP Implementation projects and Jean Auer Award are due August 10, 2007.
- Construction site management erosion control workshops beginning in August through February 2008.

7. Items for August 3, 2007 Meeting

- IC Meeting to consider final Draft Updated CCMP.
- IC Support for resolution on Updated CCMP

- CCMP Report Card workshop

8. Announcements/Adjourn

Following the August 3 meeting, the Implementation Committee will return to its quarterly meeting schedule. Next meeting will be Friday, November 2, 2007. Marcia Brockbank announced congressional funding for the National Estuary Program increased to \$28 million for FY 08 or approximately \$600,000 per program.

The meeting was Adjourned.